UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,236	09/26/2006	Nigel Hamilton	084535-000000US	8168

20350 7590 11/08/2011

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
PHAM, KHANH B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/08/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docket@kilpatricktownsend.com
ipefiling@kilpatricktownsend.com
jlhice@kilpatrick.foundationip.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,236	HAMILTON, NIGEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KHANH PHAM	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 February 2011*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *1,5-17,24,25,27-35,41,42 and 45-53* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1,5-17,24,25,27-35,41,42 and 45-53* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/10/2011 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 49, 5-8, 52 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 49 depends upon canceled claim 2. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1, 9-17, 24-25, 27-35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohen et al. (US 6,377,983 B1), hereinafter “Cohen”.

As per claim 1, Cohen teaches an automated method comprising:

- "detecting submission of a first search query from a client to at least one search engine" at Col. 7 lines 35-50 and Col. 11 lines 3-15;
- "storing a search trail corresponding to the first search query" at Col. 7 lines 35-50;
- "providing a data storage system on a server storing a plurality of search trails resulting from search queries from a same user and other users" at Col. 7 lines 50-65;
- " receiving a second search query from a client to a search engine" at Col. 8 lines 20-22;
- "searching the data storage system to match the received second search query to the first search query corresponding to at least one search trail to identify at least one related search trail stored on the data storage system" at Col. 8 lines 15-50;
- "presenting search results to the client based upon the at least one related search trail" at Col. 8 lines 15-50.

As per claim 9, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the step of detecting submission of a search query to at least one search engine is optionally selectable at the client" at Col. 11 lines 3-15.

As per claim 10, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the step of storing a search trail includes: recording the URL of the consecutively accessed sites" at Col. 7 lines 30-50.

As per claim 11, Cohen teaches the method of claim 10, wherein “the step storing a search trail further includes recording one or more of a user identifier, the network address of the client and search term or terms entered by the user at the client" at Col. 7 line 60 to Col. 8 line 14.

As per claim 12, Cohen teaches the method of claim 10, wherein “the step of storing a search trail further includes: transmitting the one or more parameters of at least one trail step identified at the client to the data storage system of the server for recordal” at Col. 7 lines 50-55.

As per claim 13, Cohen teaches the method of claim 12, further including: “initially recording the one or more parameter in a RAM table at the trail recorder server” at Col. 7 line 60 to Col. 8 line 14 .

As per claim 14, Cohen teaches the method of claim 13, and further comprising: “periodically saving RAM table data to disk-based tables at the trail recorder server” at Col. 7 line 60 to Col. 8 line 14.

As per claim 15, Cohen teaches the method of claim 14, wherein “a first disk-based table stores data characterizing each search trail” at Col. 7 line 60 to Col. 8 line 14 .

As per claim 16, Cohen teaches the method of claim 14, wherein “a second disk-based table stores data characterizing the consecutively accessed pages in each search trail” at Col. 7 lines 30-50.

As per claim 17, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein “the number of consecutively accessed sites is limited to a predetermined maximum” at Fig. 5.

As per claim 24, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein “the step of searching the data storage system to match the received search query to a search query corresponding to at least one search trail includes: conducting a full text search on the data storage system for at least part of a search query corresponding to at least one of the plurality of search trails" at Col. 8 lines 15-30.

As per claim 25, Cohen teaches the method of claim 24, wherein “step of searching the data storage system to match the received search query to a search query corresponding to at least one search trail includes: limiting the search trail to search trails resulting search queries from a same user as the received search query” at Col. 8 lines 15-30.

As per claim 27, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein “the step of presenting search results to the client based upon the at least one related search trail includes presenting the related search trails at the client” at Col. 8 lines 15-50.

As per claim 28, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein “the step of presenting search results to the client based upon the at least one related search trail includes: ordering the related search results by one or more ranking criteria” at Col. 4 lines 1-15.

As per claim 29, Cohen teaches the method of claim 28, wherein “the ranking criteria include any one or more of data, inverse document frequency match, target search engine, user identifier, or trail weight indicative of the cumulative frequency of user visits to steps in a related search trail” at Col. 4 lines 1-15.

As per claim 30, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the communication network is the Internet, an intranet, an extranet, or other network running client/server application” at Col. 6 lines 35-45.

As per claim 31, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein “the search engine is maintained on the client" at Col. 5 lines 50-55.

As per claim 32, Cohen teaches a system for presenting search results to a client based upon a search query comprising:

- “a search trail recorder for recording a search trail including at least one trail step corresponding to two consecutively accessed pages that are accessed by the client via a hyperlink between the pages” at Col. 7 lines 30-65;
- “a data storage system for storing a plurality of search trails, the search trails resulting from search queries from a same user and other users” at Col. 7 lines 30-65 ;
- “a server system programmed to provide a trail searcher for searching the data storage system to match the received search query to a search corresponding to at least one search trail to identify at least one related search trail stored on the server” at Col. 8 lines 15-50.

As per claim 33, Cohen teaches the system of claim 33 discussed above. Cohen also teaches: “a search query detector for detecting submission of a search query from the client to a search engine; and a search trail recorder for recording a search trail of one or more parameters of sites accessed consecutively following return of search query results to the client" at Col. 5 lines 45-65.

As per claim 34, Cohen teaches the system of claim 33, wherein the client computer is further programmed to provide an adapter manager for maintaining an adapter table of known search command formats for a plurality of search engines for identifying one or more search query parameters are entered by a user" at Col. 5 lines 45-65.

As per claim 35, Cohen teaches the system of claim 33, wherein "the search query detector is a toolbar, browser addon, or extension, deskbar, agent, proxy or like client side application" at Col. 5 lines 45-65.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 5-8, 41-42, 45-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cohen**, and in view of Kraft (US 7,725,526 B1), hereinafter "**Kraft**"

As per claim 41, Cohen teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Cohen does not explicitly teach: "the step of detecting submission of the search query includes: determining if part of the form object matches a known search command format of any of a plurality search engines, and maintaining an adapter table of known search command formats for a plurality of search engines for identifying one or more search query parameters are entered by a user" as claimed. However, Kraft teaches a method for sharing query history (Col. 8 lines 1-40), including a query analyzer which receives all request URL strings and detects whether the particular URL represent a search query (Col. 6 lines 6-30). Kraft teaches the step of "determining if part of the form object

matches a known search command format of any of a plurality search engines, and maintaining an adapter table of known search command formats for a plurality of search engines for identifying one or more search query parameters are entered by a user" at Col. 9 lines 1-22 and Col. 10 lines 5-35. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Kraft with Cohen's teaching in order to pride an accurate method for identifying and detecting a search query so that proper action such recording search trail can be initiated.

As per claim 42, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 41 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: wherein "the search command format includes the network address of a search engine program for executing the search query" at Col. 10 lines 20-30.

As per claim 45, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 41 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: "periodically validating the search command formats maintained in the adapter table" at Col. 10 lines 10-25.

As per claim 46, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 41 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: "automatically identifying a search command format of a new search engine and update the adapter table" at Col. 6 lines 6-45.

As per claim 47, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 41 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: "collecting search information identifying a search box page of a search engine and identifying the search command format from the search information" at Col. 6 lines 6-30.

As per claim 48, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 47 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: "the step of collecting search information includes collecting the HTML code of the search box and parsing the HTML code to identify the search command format" at Col. 6 lines 6-30.

As per claim 49, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 45 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: wherein "the step of detecting submission of a search query to at least one search engine includes detecting submission of a completed form object" at Col. 6 lines 6-30.

As per claim 5, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 49 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: wherein "the step of detecting submission of a completed form object performed at the client and includes: locating form objects in a object model of content served to a client; and adding a routine to each form object to enable interception of the completed form object upon submission" at Col. 6 lines 6-30.

As per claim 6, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 5 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: wherein "the step of locating all form objects in a document object model of content served to a client is carried out after the content has been served to the client" at Col. 6 lines 6-30.

As per claim 7, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 6 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: wherein "the content is an HTML document, and all form objects in a document object model of the HTML document are located once a DocumentComplete event occurs" at Col. 6 lines 6-30.

As per claim 8, Cohen and Kraft teach the method of claim 7 discussed above. Kraft also teaches: wherein "the HTML document includes a GET or a POST form" at Col. 6 lines 6-30.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/4/2011 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as

well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the Claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3574** for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHANH PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Khanh B. Pham/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

November 2, 2011